

Social – Economic Issue Team Meeting
2/13/02
USDA Service Center Conference Room

Agenda

- 2:00 – 2:45 – Presentation by Bob Parker and Josh Bruce of U of O on Social Survey)
2:45 – 4:00 – Discussion of survey results and next steps for review and comment
4:00 – 4:30 – Review of last meeting assignments and agenda items for next meeting

NEXT MEETING TO BE ANNOUNCED VIA E-MAIL. EITHER AFTER E-MAIL FEEDBACK ON SURVEY IF COMMENTS LEAD US TO HAVE ANOTHER MEETING TO DISCUSS, OR AFTER DRAFT EIS ALTERNATIVES HAVE BEEN DEVELOPED – PROBABLY SOME TIME IN LATE APRIL.

Attending: MerrieSue Carlson, Governor’s Office; Barbara Pieper private landowner; Dick Brown, City of Prineville; Ed Faulkner, private landowner; Martin Winch, private landowner; Bob Graves private landowner; Mike Templeton; Community advocate; George Read, Deschutes County; Clay Penhollow; Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs; Mollie Chaudet, BLM

Not Attending: Terry Eccles, Oregon State Parks and Recreation, JoAnne Sutherland, City of Redmond, Scott Cooper, Crook County

Guest Speakers: Bob Parker, Josh Bruce, University of Oregon

Public: None present

U of O presentation on Social Survey findings: Draft executive summary handed out and Bob Parker of U of O gave a presentation on the draft survey report, including some of the results from the City of Redmond survey that was done independently, but included questions about some uses of BLM lands for roads and urban growth expansion. The draft report was just available to Mollie today.

After Mollie has reviewed the initial draft and given any feedback she has to Bob, the Issue the Team will have a chance to review the full draft report (including the 33 pages of written comment that the public had an opportunity to “fill in” on the survey, but that is not in the actual numbers of the survey) and give comments to Mollie. The Issue Team review should reflect the following:

- Are there any cross tabulations between survey question results that could improve our ability to interpret the results of both? Are there causal links that can be inferred by comparing subsets of the sample? For instance, a cross tabulation between economic reliance and non-recreation users might give an indication of what uses are contributing to the 2% of respondents that indicated income greater than \$100,000 per year from public lands.
- Is there any insight of your own that might contribute toward better interpretation of the results? For instance, Dick Brown indicated that \$100,000 income could represent a portion of a rancher’s gross assets (e.g. 125 steers) but may not be a net benefit that would be directly attributed to public lands.

Timeline for completion of survey report review – Draft report to Issue Team – first week of March; **feedback needed a week from receipt draft report** – e-mail to Barbara Pieper who will consolidate comments and give to Mollie. Mollie will review and give feedback to team and to Bob Parker, final survey due out by end of March for posting to web site.

Comments on presentation

- May want to cross tab to which people (spend lots of time vs. little) that answered specific questions (e.g.: Q-14) were they resource users vs. recreationists? Is this something the sample would give us any good information about?
- Respondent's mean age may not very representative of the general public; 50-year-old males may not be the strongest component of those that may be using the land in the next 12-20 years. Is there any thought about taking the survey questions to a college to make sure we get a younger population as well that might be more representative of future users?
- Is there sample bias because of using the BLM mailing list? Is there any way to tell whether there were, for instance, a greater number of environmental responses because of the composition of the mailing list?
- Is the total response (return rate) one U of O is satisfied with in order to give a representative sample to the general population?
- Do people understand how this information will be used? Is there an opportunity for general or open public comment on the report?
- Suggestion – that the report should be shared with the other issue teams so that they can reflect on the results and see how that adds to their understanding of the issues, and the range of alternatives. A copy of the Redmond survey would also be valued by the team.
- Suggestion – when the BLM makes this information available, make sure that there is adequate information available about how the information will be used.

Responses to comments:

- They (U of O) have not done a summary of response by different age groups – and there are some limitations given that no one under 18 who could respond – but there might be a way the researchers can look at the dispersal of responses by age and gender. They will look at and compare to the demographics of Central Oregon, but their initial interpretations, based on the variety of response, are that the sample could be pretty indicative of the portion of the population that use BLM lands.
- Sampling - They feel the response was adequate to infer a projection to total population with a reasonable statistical confidence factor. Given the wide dispersal of responses on a wide variety of questions, they generally feel that there was a wide array of respondents; people represented the whole spectrum of values, especially when also viewed with the 33 pages of comments. The BLM mailing list was not the only sample – there was also a random sample of the general populace. A detailed evaluation of the mailing list would be very difficult and, in balance, may not add that much more to our understanding of the results. Mollie reiterated that the survey results were not going to be the only information used to analyze the impacts of the

range of alternatives that will be developed, and there will be no decisions that are based solely on the results of the survey. It will be used as one piece of information to be considered along with other public comment on the AMS and the thoughts and perceptions of the individual Issue Teams. The BLM does not at present have the funding or resources to submit the survey to a specific sampling group, and a way to insure that we did not bias the sample in favor of a particular age or gender group would be needed.

- Public comment on draft report – the BLM is not willing to make the report available for a general public comment period prior to completion of the final report. The existing contract with U of O does not include evaluating general public comments on the report, and the BLM does not have the resources programmed to meet the demands of a public comment evaluation and response to the report. The final report will be available to the public, along with an explanation of how that will be used. Right now it is anticipated for that to be posted on the web site.
- Issue Team distribution – all issue teams will have the final report and comments to consider before we finalize the range of alternatives, along with the Summary of Public Comments on the AMS (note: this should be available on the web site next week).
- Availability of Redmond Survey results – Deschutes County intends to post on their web site the final report, and will provide the team with a copy when it is finalized.

Martin mentioned a concern that had been raised at the all Issue Team meeting in January. The concern was raised by another issue team member over how the Social and Economic team was “different” than the other teams in that they would be reviewing and providing feedback on how the other teams were addressing social and economic values, and input into what factors were going to be analyzed, but not developing alternatives themselves. The concern was that this team could veto or undermine anything the other teams developed. Mollie tried to alleviate this concern by assuring the other teams that was not true, and this team had no more veto authority than any others, but their focus was to give feedback to the other teams, as the other teams will give feedback to each other.

Meeting was concluded with no other discussion points.